

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/926,589	ROUSSEAU ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Michael G. Hartley	1616

**All Participants:**

**Status of Application:** allowed

(1) Michael G. Hartley. (3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Wm. Player (Appl. repr.). (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 13 September 2004

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

Telephonic  
 Video Conference  
 Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant  Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:  Yes  No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner called Mr. Player to request providing a Post card receipt as evidence that an IDS was filed 09/926,589, as such filing was contradictory to the PTO's record. Mr. Player informed the examiner that the post card receipt was not available, but would look into docket records and log books. Mr. Player was advised by the examiner that any responses filed under 1.312 filed after the payment of the issue fee must be done accordingly (see attached response to 1.312).